84-1623

Office - Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
APR 15 1985
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS
CLERK

No. ___

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States
OCTOBER TERM, 1984

VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA—
MINNESOTA-BAR NONE BOYS RANCH,
Petitioner,

v.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

JOHN M. HUSBAND
(Counsel of Record)
MICHAEL M. SHULTZ
HOLLAND & HART
555 Seventeenth Street
Suite 2900
P.O. Box 8749
Denver, Colorado 80201
(303) 295-8000
Attorneys for Petitioner

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the National Labor Relations Act grants the National Labor Relations Board jurisdiction over the Volunteers of America Bar None Boys Ranch for emotionally disturbed children when that organization is engaged in the primary religious activities of an established church.

2. Whether the exercise of jurisdiction over the Volunteers of America Bar None Boys Ranch violates the Religion Clauses of the First Amendment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i
OPINIONS DELIVERED BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	3
REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	8
1. *The Court of Appeals' Decision is in Conflict with a Decision of this Court*	8
2. *Board Jurisdiction over the Ranch would Significantly Entangle the Government in Religious Affairs and Infringe the Freedom of Religion*	14
3. *There is No Clear Expression of an Affirmative Intention of Congress that Staff at the Ranch Should be Covered by the National Labor Relations Act*	16
CONCLUSION	17
APPENDIX	
Volunteers of America—Minnesota-Bar None Boys Ranch v. NLRB, 752 F.2d 345 (8th Cir. 1985)	a1
Volunteers of America—Minnesota-Bar None Boys Ranch, 269 NLRB No. 176 (1984)	a9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES:	
Cantwell v. Connecticut, 310 US 296 (1940)	14
Catholic Bishop of Chicago, 224 NLRB 1221 (1976)	8
Catholic Bishop of Chicago v. NLRB, 559 F.2d 1112 (7th Cir. 1977)	9
Everson v. Board of Education, 330 US 1 (1946)	14
NLRB v. Catholic Bishop of Chicago, 440 US 490 (1979)	8, *passim*
NLRB v. St. Louis Christian Home, 663 F.2d 60 (8th Cir. 1981)	10, 12
St. Elizabeth Community Hospital v. NLRB, 626 F.2d 123 (9th Cir. 1980)	12
Sherbert v. Verner, 374 US 398 (1963)	14
United States v. Ballard, 322 US 78 (1944)	14
Volunteers of America—Minnesota-Bar None Boys Ranch, 269 NLRB No. 176 (1984)	1
Volunteers of America—Minnesota-Bar None Boys Ranch v. NLRB, 752 F.2d 345 (8th Cir. 1985)	1
STATUTES:	
Judicial Code and Judiciary, 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1)	2
National Labor Relations Act, 29 U.S.C. § 152(2)	2, 17
National Labor Relations Act, 29 U.S.C. § 151 *et seq.*	7
National Labor Relations Act, 29 U.S.C. § 158(d)	16
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS:	
U.S. Constitutional Amendment I	2
PUBLIC LAWS:	
Public Law 93-360, 88 Stat 395	17
MISCELLANEOUS:	
Committee Comment, Rule 15 of Rules of United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit	2
HR 3020, 80th Cong., 1st Sess. (1947)	17
1 National Labor Relations Board, *Legislative History of the Labor Management Relations Act*, 1947, p. 34 (1948)	17
HR Rep. No. 245, 80th Cong., 1st Sess., 12 (1947)	17
Legislative History of the Coverage of Non-Profit Hospitals Under the National Labor Relations Act, 1974, 93rd Cong., 2d Sess., 118, 331-32 (1974)	17

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States
OCTOBER TERM, 1984

VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA—
MINNESOTA-BAR NONE BOYS RANCH,
Petitioner,

v.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

Volunteers of America—Minnesota-Bar None Boys Ranch petitions for a Writ of Certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit in this case.

OPINIONS DELIVERED BELOW

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is reported at 752 F.2d 345 (1985) and is printed in its entirety in the Appendix attached hereto at pages App. 1-8. The opinion of the National Labor Relations Board is reported at 269 NLRB No. 176 (1984) and printed in its entirety in the Appendix attached hereto at pages App. 9-16.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Court of Appeals (App. at 1-8) was entered January 15, 1985. A petition for rehearing is not required by the Court of Appeals prior to petitioning for a Writ of Certiorari. Committee Comment, Rule 15 of the Rules of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1). The parties who have an interest in this Petition are the National Labor Relations Board and the Teamster's Local No. 638.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Constitutional Provision

U. S. Constitutional Amendment I. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Statutes

29 U.S.C. § 152(2). "The term 'employer' includes any person acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include the United States or any wholly owned Government corporation, or any Federal Reserve Bank, or any State or political subdivision thereof, or any person subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time, or any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer), or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization."

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Facts Material to an Understanding of the Issues

The Bar None Boys Ranch ("the Ranch") is a religious residential treatment center for children which is operated by the Volunteers of America—Minnesota ("VOA-MN"), an unincorporated association which operates under the direction of the National Society of the Volunteers of America ("VOA"). (T-16, 47).[1] The VOA is a religious movement which started in New York City in 1896. (T-15). The VOA's purpose was and is to reach and uplift all segments of the population and to bring to persons in need the knowledge of God. The Church prospered and spread across the country with numerous "posts" being established. The Minnesota Post was established in 1896. (T-16).

Both the Minnesota Post and the National Society are recognized and established religious orders. (T-17). The Internal Revenue Service and the United States Department of Commerce recognize that the VOA is a church. (T-40). The Church is exempt under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code and all contributions to the VOA are tax deductible. The State of Minnesota also has granted the VOA an exemption as a non-profit religious organization. (T-17, 19).

The Minnesota Post of the VOA is part of the VOA's mid-western region and is under the direction of Reverend Jack L. Dignum. All of the officers of the National Society of the

[1] An administrative hearing on the issue of jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board ("the Board" or "the NLRB") over the VOA-MN took place on August 19, 1983 before Hearing Officer Frank Kapsch, in Minneapolis, Minnesota, at the Regional Offices of the Board. Case 18-RC-13483. References to the transcript of those proceedings will be in the form of "T-" followed by the page number(s) on which the cited testimony can be found.

Volunteers of America either are ordained or licensed ministers. (T-21). In Minnesota, there are 45 ministers, including Reverend Dignum, working for the VOA. (T-16). VOA ministers operate every post in the United States and administer their programs according to the religious tenets of the VOA. Reverend James Hogie operates the Minnesota Post.

The unique character of the VOA and its various posts was explained by the United States Treasury Department when it ruled on the VOA's tax status:

> ... The primary purpose of The Volunteers of America is to conduct evangelistic, religious, missionary services and that all other activities in which this organization may engage are secondary to that primary purpose and are but a means to the end of bringing those who you serve to the immediate knowledge and active service of God.

The VOA and its posts do not attempt to persuade persons to believe in any particular "brand" of religion; rather, persons are encouraged to return to the active service of God according to their own religious beliefs. Moreover, unlike more traditional Christian denominations with which the public may be more familiar, proselytizing and preaching are not the manner in which the VOA seeks to attain its religious goals. Its express historical and present mission is to provide service to those members of society most in need. The VOA believes that service to the needy is grounded in, and ordered by, the Holy Scriptures.

For the VOA, social service programs are *not* a "secular activity" of the Church. Daily service to humanity is the very essence of the VOA's existence. The basic tenet of the Church is that people who are helped will come to find God through the good work and counseling received in the VOA programs. Because the VOA and its posts do not maintain churches in the traditional sense and do not conduct religious "services" in the traditional sense, the social services provided to those in need

are the religious activities of the Church. Thus, while a Catholic, Methodist or Lutheran Church may provide social services as an auxiliary function, the so-called "social services" that are the subject of this litigation are the primary religious activities of the VOA. The provision of service to the needy is as sacred to the VOA as is communion for the Catholic and Protestant religions.

The VOA's religious philosophy is contained in the Manual of the National Society of the Volunteers of America. Article I of the VOA's Constitution is found in the Manual. It stresses that the VOA "is a movement organized for the reaching and up-lifting of all sections of the people and bringing them to the immediate knowledge and active service of God." Because the VOA believes that the physical as well as the spiritual needs of the needy must be met to bring a person to the active service of God, the VOA's primary religious activities are directed at the "whole" person. People who are helped by the VOA will come to find God through the good work and counseling received in VOA programs and through the example set by the life and work of VOA members. Indeed, many, if not most, of those who become ministers in the VOA, are employees who became interested in the Church as a result of providing social services to the needy. In turn, many of these employees were recipients of the VOA's services. Thus, employees are viewed as the primary source for future converts, but these employees must first serve with the Church for one year.

The Ranch, as are all VOA programs, is operated in strict accordance with the Church's religious philosophy. The religious principles of the VOA underlie the decisions of the Ranch's management and the actions of the employees.

The Ranch is a religious residential treatment center for children who are handicapped due to emotional problems, behavioral problems, autism, neurological problems and developmental delays. (T-47). Religion is an integral part of the

Ranch program which is addressed to the child's entire needs—spiritual, physical and emotional. Although the VOA believes that the whole child must be helped, there is a Director of Religious Education on the Ranch staff who is responsible for coordinating the religious and spiritual activities of the children. (T-50).

One significant means by which the staff is included in the spiritual guidance of the children is through involvement in the Chapel Committee. The Chapel Committee is made up of the Religious Director, the child care staff and social workers. (*Id.*). However, the VOA believes that all staff members, whether or not they belong to the Church, are involved in the spiritual development of the child by serving the child's physical and emotional needs. Ranch employees are fully apprised of the religious nature of the VOA and the Ranch and told that they are expected to carry out the religious mission of the VOA during their employment at the Ranch. (T-51). An employee is evaluated on how well he or she carries out the religious mission of the VOA. (T-61 to 62). Indeed, it is hoped that after one year of service, the employee will become a member of the Church. The VOA's religious mission permeates every aspect of the Ranch program, including the hiring, evaluating and retaining of employees.

Although employees are not required to be Church members, they are expected to comply with the religious mandates of the VOA. Many employees do become Church members, but are not elevated to management status by virtue of becoming a Church member. Rather, Church members are placed in all levels of the organization for the purpose of best utilizing their skills.

To the layperson, unfamiliar with the philosophy and mission of the VOA, the services provided by Ranch employees appear to be secular activities of the Church. Nothing could be further from the truth. The employees of the Ranch, whether

or not they are Church members, are responsible for carrying out the Church's primary religious mission: helping people to find God through the good work and counseling received at the Ranch.

Procedure Below

On July 28, 1983, the Teamsters Local No. 638 ("the Union") filed a petition for certification of representation with the Board, seeking to represent "all full-time and regular part-time employees" at the Ranch, but excluding office clerical, guards and supervisors. A jurisdictional hearing was held on August 19, 1983, and on September 1, 1983, the Board issued its Decision and Direction of Election. The Board designated all full-time and regular part-time maintenance, laundry, housekeeping and childcare workers employed by the Ranch as the appropriate bargaining unit. The VOA-MN sought review of the Board's Decision, but review was denied. The Union received a majority of the votes cast in the representation election on September 29, 1983.

On December 5, 1983, a Complaint and Notice of Hearing were issued against VOA-MN-Bar None Boys Ranch, alleging, *inter alia,* that VOA-MN had failed and refused to bargain with the Union as the exclusive collective bargaining representative of unit employees. On or about April 28, 1984, the Board issued its Decision and Order, holding that VOA-MN had committed an unfair labor practice by its refusal to recognize and bargain with the Union. The Decision is reported at 269 NLRB No. 176 (App. 9-16).

VOA-MN sought review of the Board's Decision and Order pursuant to Sections 10(e) and (f) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, 29 U.S.C. §§ 151 *et seq.,* in the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. The Board filed a Cross Application for Enforcement in the same

court. On January 15, 1985, the Court of Appeals affirmed the Board's Decision and granted enforcement of the Board's Order. (App. 1-8).

Throughout these proceedings, VOA-MN has maintained that Congress did not intend to bring the Church within the jurisdiction of the Board, but that if it did so intend, the exercise of jurisdiction will violate the Religion Clauses of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

1. *The Court of Appeals' Decision is in Conflict with a Decision of this Court.*

This Court addressed a situation remarkably similar to the instant case in *NLRB v. Catholic Bishop of Chicago,* 440 U.S. 490 (1979). In that case, following Board certification of unions as the collective bargaining representatives for lay-teachers employed in Catholic high schools, the schools refused to recognize and bargain with the unions. As a consequence, the unions filed unfair labor practice charges with the Board. In the unfair labor practice proceedings on the technical refusal to bargain, the schools challenged the Board's exercise of jurisdiction over their operations on both statutory and constitutional grounds. The Board issued cease and desist orders against the schools and contended that it had jurisdiction when schools were "religiously associated" and not "completely religious." 224 NLRB 1221 (1976).

The United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit denied enforcement of the Board's orders, ruling that the Board's standard for exercising its discretion to extend its jurisdiction to religiously affiliated schools was not a workable guide and that the First Amendment's "free exercise" and "establishment" clauses prohibited the Board from exercising

jurisdiction. *Catholic Bishop of Chicago v. NLRB.* 559 F.2d 1112 (7th Cir. 1977).

This Court affirmed the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, holding that the absence of an "affirmative intention of the Congress clearly expressed" to bring teachers in church-operated schools within the jurisdiction of the Board would deny the Board such jurisdiction. 440 U.S. 506-07. The alternative to requiring the presence of an "affirmative intention by Congress clearly expressed" was "to resolve difficult and sensitive questions arising out of the guarantees of the First Amendment Religion Clauses." *Id.* at 507.

The Court determined that "difficult and sensitive questions" involving the Religion Clauses would arise if the Board asserted jurisdiction because of a "a significant risk that the First Amendment will be infringed" if the Board asserts jurisdiction over church-operated schools. *Id.* at 502. After noting the general potential for entanglement of government in religion when the government becomes involved in church-operated schools, the Court examined two specific ways in which the Board's jurisdiction would cause excessive entanglement in the affairs of the church. First, the resolution of many unfair labor practice charges would "necessarily involve inquiry into the good faith of the position asserted by the clergy-administrators and its relationship to the school's religious mission. It is not only the conclusions that may be reached by the Board which may impinge on rights guaranteed by the Religion Clauses, but the very process of inquiry leading to findings and conclusions." *Id.* (footnote omitted).

Second, the "Board will be called upon to decide what are 'terms and conditions of employment' and therefore mandatory subjects of bargaining. . . . Inevitably the Board's inquiry will implicate sensitive issues that open the door to conflicts between clergy-administrators and the Board, or conflicts with negotiators for unions." *Id.* at 502-03. As a result of the nature of the

Board's control over the church-employer, this Court concluded: "We see no escape from conflicts flowing from the Board's exercise of jurisdiction over teachers in church-operated schools and the consequent serious First Amendment questions that would follow." *Id.* at 504.

Rather than rule that the National Labor Relations Act is unconstitutional as it applies to church-operated schools, this Court searched for a "clear expresion of an affirmative intention of Congress that teachers in church-operated schools should be covered by the Act." *Id.* After closely examining the legislative history of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended in 1947 and 1974, the Court determined that no clear expression of an affirmative intention by Congress to bring church-operated schools within the jurisdiction of the Board could be found. *Id.* at 506-07. Thus, the church-operated schools had not violated the National Labor Relations Act by virtue of their refusal to bargain with the unions.

The Court of Appeals' decision in this action is in direct conflict with the Court's decision in *Catholic Bishop.* The Court of Appeals relied on its decision in *NLRB v. St. Louis Christian Home,* 663 F.2d 60 (8th Cir. 1981) (*Christian Home*), wherein it held that "a child care facility operated by the Christian Church, was essentially secular in operation and differed significantly from parochial schools." (App. at 5).

The court's effort to compare the Ranch with the Christian Church's child care facility and to distinguish the Ranch from a parochial school manifests a profound misunderstanding of the very essence of the VOA and its service activities. The degree of similarity between the Ranch and the parochial schools that were the subject of *Catholic Bishop* is striking. First, and most obviously, both the Ranch and the schools are operated by recognized churches. Second, the Ranch and the schools are means by which the respective churches are made known to others. This Petition already has explained the unique nature

of the VOA and its philosophy of bringing people in need closer to God by serving the whole person. The services provided to troubled youth at the Ranch are not ancillary to the VOA's primary religious activities; the services *are* the primary religious activities. Indeed, it can be said that services provided by the Ranch are more inextricably intertwined with the fundamental mission of the VOA than are the parochial schools with the Catholic Church. The services provided by the VOA to the needy, including troubled youth, are the exclusive means by which the VOA seeks to bring to people a knowledge of God. It also is the primary means by which the VOA recruits converts.

The third similarity between the Ranch and the parochial schools is that employees of both are engaged in the religious instruction of children. The record at the underlying jurisdictional hearing is replete with references to the duty of Ranch counselors to propagate the VOA religion to the children staying at the Ranch. (T-30, 31, 39, 50, 52 and 62). For example, when Reverend Dignum was examined at the hearing, the following exchange occurred:

> **Q.** Do the employees at Bar None engage in religious training?
>
> **A.** Yes, they do.
>
> **Q.** Do they participate in the religious mission of the VOA?
>
> **A.** Yes, we even have a person there who is in charge of religious activities.
>
> **Q.** That is a full-time staff person?
>
> **A.** Yes.

(T-39). Moreover, counselors at the Ranch are evaluated upon how well they fulfill this mission. (T-52, 62). Mr. Weight, the Program Director at the Ranch, testified that employees not

only are required to carry out the religious mission of the VOA and are evaluated on their performance of this duty, but there also is a separate segment of the job review that relates specifically to fulfillment of the VOA's mission. (T-62). Thus, the extent to which Ranch counselors are involved in religious instruction is two-fold: They actively propagate the religious values of the VOA, but more importantly, by serving the various needs of troubled youth, the VOA believes that those children will come to know God.

With all due respect, it is submitted that the services provided by the VOA, including services at the Ranch, are different in kind from the secular services provided by other religious denominations. For example, in *Christian Home,* the child care facility is not the primary religious activity of the Christian Church. Similarly, in *St. Elizabeth Community Hospital v. NLRB*, 626 F.2d 123 (9th Cir. 1980), another case relied upon by the Court of Appeals, the hospital was not the primary religious activity of the church which operated the hospital. In contrast, VOA's very reason for existence is to provide for the needs of the less fortunate in our society for the singular and express purpose of bringing those persons closer to God.

The language used by the Court of Appeals to distinguish the instant case from *Catholic Bishop* demonstrates the infirmities in the Court of Appeals' reasoning. The court argued that "the Ranch resembles a secular institution . . . its primary purpose [is] the care of children, not the propagation of faith. . . . The Ranch and its employees perform essentially secular functions." (App. at 6.) All of these arguments could be made with respect to parochial schools which "resemble" secular schools, their "primary purpose" is education and "employees perform essentially secular functions."

What particularly troubled the Court of Appeals was the fact that counselors did not "preach" a particular brand of religion nor try "to persuade children to accept VOA sectarian

doctrines." Moreover, religious services "are conducted at the Ranch by ministers of various denominations from the community." (App. at 6). The Court of Appeals is correct in describing the Ranch, but wholly misunderstands the VOA's religious principles. The VOA does not preach the tenets of any particular religious denomination; rather, the Church serves the most fundamental needs of the unfortunates in our society so that those persons will gain a closer knowledge and personal understanding of God. The VOA is not concerned with the particular "brand" of religion which each person chooses to follow. Put more simply, the Ranch's primary purpose is to permit the children to gain the knowledge of God and the means for accomplishing this purpose is to help the children to overcome their social, emotional and behavioral difficulties. Indeed, it may be inappropriate to speak of "purposes" and "means" because the two virtually are inseparable.

The fact that there are secular analogs to the religious activities of the VOA does not diminish the totally religious character of those activities. Furthermore, the existence of secular analogs does not empower the Court of Appeals to question the validity of the VOA's religious beliefs. When an organization establishes itself as a *bona fide* religious organization, its beliefs are beyond dispute by the government.

The distinctions which the Court of Appeals has drawn between this case and *Catholic Bishop* represent the proverbial distinction without a difference. The Court of Appeals has limited the holding of *Catholic Bishop* to the facts of that case; yet, there is nothing in this Court's opinion in *Catholic Bishop* to suggest that church-operated schools are the only church-operated activities not within the jurisdiction of the Board.

2. *Board Jurisdiction over the Ranch would Significantly Entangle the Government in Religious Affairs and Infringe the Freedom of Religion.*

The debate over the similarities and dissimilarities between this action and *Catholic Bishop* is secondary to the more important issue of the effect of the Board's jurisdiction over the Ranch. The First Amendment erected a wall that separates church and state in matters of religion. This Court has said of the wall: "We could not approve the slightest breach." *Everson v. Board of Education,* 330 U.S. 1, 18 (1946). The only justification for becoming entangled in or infringing religion occurs when "the gravest abuses, endangering paramount interests, give occasion for permissible limitation." *Sherbert v. Verner,* 374 U.S. 398, 406 (1963). It is inevitable that conflict will flow from the Board's intervention in the affairs of the Church. Under the First Amendment, the nature of religious beliefs virtually is beyond question by government officials. *Cantwell v. Connecticut,* 310 U.S. 296, 303 (1940). As the late Justice Douglas explained in *United States v. Ballard,* 322 U.S. 78, 86-7 (1944): "Men may believe what they cannot prove. They may not be put to the proof of their religious doctrines or beliefs. Religious experiences which are as real as life to some may be incomprehensible to others."

The VOA's religious beliefs and goals have been held for over eight decades. These beliefs are not mere "shams and absurdities," unentitled to the protection of the First Amendment; they are deeply rooted in the time-honored Christian principles of caring for and counseling those less fortunate than one's self. Yet, these administrative and judicial proceedings have caused the VOA to be put to the proof of its religious beliefs. At the underlying jurisdictional hearing, numerous witnesses were called on behalf of the Church to *explain* their religion and to *justify* their belief that the provision of social services is, for the VOA, a primary religious activity and not something that merely is ancillary to the Church's primary

mission. More startling is the refusal of the Court of Appeals to acknowledge the essential religious character of the services provided by the Ranch. The Court's assertion that the services "resemble" secular activities is the same position taken by the Board in *Catholic Bishop* where it argued that parochial schools were not "completely religious," but only were "religiously associated." 440 U.S. 490, 494 n. 7. However, it should not be the province of the Court of Appeals or the Board to determine just how religious the VOA's activities are. It becomes apparent that the Court of Appeals was unable to accept the VOA's religious beliefs by recharacterizing the Church's primary mission as "essentially secular."

There are, however, other significant ways in which entanglement and infringement will follow the Board's intervention into the affairs of the Ranch. First, the Board will be called upon to resolve charges of unfair labor practice which may be brought against the VOA. Yet, because the entire management of the Ranch is vested in the officers of the VOA, all of whom are licensed or ordained ministers, "the resolution of such charges by the Board, in many instances, will necessarily involve inquiry into the good faith of the position asserted by the clergy-administrators and its relationship to the [Ranch's] religious mission." *Catholic Bishop,* 440 U.S. at 502. Although many staff members at the Ranch are not VOA members, they are expected to assist in fulfilling the Church's mission and are required to abide by the tenets of the Church. Moreover, the VOA considers that the staff is the primary source for new recruits following a mandatory year of service. The very process by which the Board would investigate an unfair labor practice charge significantly risks entanglement into the affairs of the Church and infringement of VOA members' freedom to exercise their religion. *See Catholic Bishop,* 440 U.S. at 502.

The second serious point at which government will be entangled in religious affairs and risk infringing freedom of religion is the employer's statutory duty to bargain over terms and conditions of employment. *See* 29 U.S.C. § 158(d). Virtually everything that occurs at the Ranch affects the staff and could be considered a "condition of employment." For example, the VOA requires that the staff abide by the tenets of the Church, yet if the Union is successful in bargaining for a "just cause" dismissal standard, a court or the Board could be called upon to determine whether dismissal for breach of the Church's religious tenets constitutes just cause. Likewise, the Union could bargain for release from Chapel Committee activities, and if the VOA refused to bargain on this issue, the Board would be called upon to determine whether participation in such activities was a "condition of employment."

Board jurisdiction over the Ranch inevitably will lead to conflicts between the government and the Church, resulting in a substantial risk of governmental entanglement in the affairs of the Church and infringement of the Church's religious beliefs. This risk is more real than in *Catholic Bishop* because the VOA is engaged in its primary religious activities at the Ranch.

3. *There is No Clear Expression of an Affirmative Intention of Congress that Staff at the Ranch Should be Covered by the National Labor Relations Act.*

Because Board jurisdiction over the Ranch would raise serious constitutional issues, an express intention by Congress to extend the Board's jurisdiction over the Ranch must be found before determining that such jurisdiction exists. A review of the legislative history of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 ("NLRA" or "the Act") demonstrates no clear expression of an affirmative intention by Congress that laypersons involved in the primary religious activities of a church should be covered by the Act. When Congress enacted the NLRA, its principal

concern was with counterbalancing the collective rights of employers which had been authorized by the National Industrial Recovery Act. *See Catholic Bishop*, 440 U.S. at 505. Thus, congressional attention was focused on employment in the private sector.

Although the definition of "employer" in the NLRA was modified by passage of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 (Taft-Hartley) and more recently by Public Law 93-360, 88 Stat. 395, nothing in the legislative histories of those laws indicates that Congress intended to extend Board jurisdiction over a church-operated residential treatment center for troubled youth. *See* HR 3020, 80th Cong., 1st Sess. (1947); 1 National Labor Relations Board, *Legislative History of the Labor Management Relations Act*, 1947, p. 34 (1948); HR Rep. No. 245, 80th Cong., 1st Sess., 12 (1947); *Legislative History of the Coverage of Non-profit Hospitals under the National Labor Relations Act*, 1974, 93d Cong., 2d Sess., 118, 331-32 (1974). At present, the NLRA defines an employer as:

> . . . any person acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include the United States or any wholly owned Government corporation, or any Federal Reserve Bank, or any State or political subdivision thereof, or any person subject to the Railway Labor Act, as amended from time to time, or any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer), or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization.

29 U.S.C. § 152(2). One need only look to Congress' "[f]indings and declaration of policy" to discern that it did not contemplate coverage of a church-operated residential treatment center—especially when that treatment center is part of the church's primary religious activities. *See id.* § 151.

CONCLUSION

The absence of an affirmative intention of Congress, clearly expressed, justifies the conclusion that Congress did not contemplate that the Board would require a church-operated

residential treatment center engaged in the primary religious activities of the church to grant recognition to a union as the bargaining agent for the center's staff. A contrary finding would necessarily lead to holding that the NLRA is unconstitutional as it applies to the Church. The Court of Appeals' decision in this matter is contrary to the decision of this Court and, therefore, should be reversed.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays that a Writ of Certiorari issue from this Honorable Court to review the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit in *VOA-Minnesota—Bar None Boys Ranch v. NLRB*. In the event that the Petition is granted, Petitioner prays that the decision of the court below be reversed.

April 12, 1985

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLAND & HART

By: /s/ JOHN M. HUSBAND

John M. Husband
Michael M. Shultz III
555 Seventeenth Street
Suite 2900
P.O. Box 8749
Denver, Colorado 80201
(303) 295-8000
Attorneys for Petitioner
VOA-MINNESOTA—BAR NONE BOYS RANCH

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

No. 84-1536

Volunteers of America—
Minnesota-Bar None Boys Ranch,
Petitioner,

v.

National Labor Relations Board,
Respondent.

Petition for Review of Order of the National Labor Relations Board

Submitted: November 16, 1984
Filed: January 15, 1985

Before BRIGHT, MCMILLIAN and BOWMAN, Circuit Judges.

MCMILLIAN, Circuit Judge.

The Volunteers of America-Minnesota (VOA-Minnesota) seeks review of an order of the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) requiring the VOA-Minnesota Bar None Boys Ranch (the Ranch) to bargain with the union representing the employees of the Ranch. The NLRB has cross-applied for enforcement of its order. For denial of enforcement, the VOA-Minnesota argues that (1) the NLRB improperly exercised jurisdiction over the Ranch and (2) the exercise of jurisdiction infringed the "free exercise" and "establishment" clauses of the first amendment. For the reasons discussed below, we affirm the decision of the NLRB and grant enforcement of the NLRB's order.

The Ranch is a religiously-affiliated residential treatment center for children that is operated by the VOA-Minnesota, an unincorporated association that operates under the direction of the National Society of the VOA. The VOA is a religious movement that started in New York City in 1896. The VOA-Minnesota Post was also established is 1896. The VOA-Minnesota Post and the National Society are recognized as religious orders. The VOA is recognized as a church by the Internal Revenue Service and by the Commerce Department. The state of Minnesota has also granted the VOA an exemption as a non-profit organization and has recognized the VOA as a church. The VOA does not pay federal income tax, federal F.I.C.A. tax, state tax, sales tax, or property tax. All of the officers of the National Society of VOA are either ordained or licensed ministers.

The VOA is divided into four regions nationally and the regions are divided into state organizations called posts. The posts, directed by ordained ministers, in turn are responsible for the VOA programs operated in the post. The Ranch is in the Minnesota Post, which is directed by Reverend James Hogie.

The VOA's basic religious philosophy is set out in ten "cardinal doctrines" in Article XI of the VOA's constitution. The VOA does not solicit new members to the VOA. Rather, the VOA is committed to assisting persons to return to and to actively practice the faith of their choice. The VOA is offered as a church only to those who have not already chosen a religious faith. Although the VOA does not attempt to proselytize new members, it does seek to bring people to a knowledge of God by providing humanitarian services to those in need. One such program for doing this is the Ranch.

The Ranch is a coeducational residential treatment facility in Anoka, Minnesota, for children with emotional, neurological and developmental problems. The director of the Ranch, Verlyn Wenndt, has responsibility for all services provided by

the Ranch and reports to Reverend James Hogie. The Ranch's program director, Larry Weight, has responsibility for the Ranch's internal operations. Neither is an ordained minister nor does the record indicate that any VOA ministers work at the Ranch. The director of religious education is responsible for coordinating the religious and spiritual activities of the children. A chapel committee, made up of the director of religious education, the child care staff and social workers, also takes part in planning the spiritual and religious aspects of the program at the Ranch.

On July 28, 1983, Teamsters Local No. 683 filed with the NLRB's regional office in Minneapolis, Minnesota, a petition for a representation election among the Ranch's maintenance, laundry, housekeeping and child care workers. A hearing officer from the NLRB regional office conducted a non-adversary hearing on issues raised by the petition. The Ranch contended at the hearing that the Ranch operates as a part of the VOA and that the NLRB's assertion of jurisdiction is impermissible under the National Labor Relations Act (the Act), as amended, 29 U.S.C. § 151 *et seq.* (1982), and the religion clauses of the first amendment because of the risk of excessive governmental entanglement with religion.

On September 1, 1983, the acting regional director of the NLRB directed that an election be held and found that the Ranch's facility

> provides an essentially secular charitable service in a sectarian manner; that eligibility to participate as a resident of [the facility] is determined without regard to religious affiliation; that the employees . . . are hired without regard to religious affiliation; that the employees . . . are not required to join the national [religious] organization; [and] that the duties of these employees do not include the propagation of the national organization's substantive religious convictions.

On September 28, 1983, the NLRB denied the Ranch's request for review. On September 29, 1983, a representation election was held and the union won by a vote of 33 to 6. Subsequently, the NLRB's acting regional director certified the union as the collective bargaining representative of the Ranch's maintenance, laundry, housekeeping, and child care workers.

After the Ranch refused the union's oral request to begin collective bargaining, the union filed an unfair labor practice charge alleging that the Ranch's refusal to bargain was unlawful. A complaint was issued on the charge alleging that the Ranch's refusal to bargain with the union violated § 158(a)(5) of the Act. The Ranch admitted its refusal to bargain but asserted that the refusal was not unlawful because the NLRB's exercise of jurisdiction over it was improper. On April 17, 1984, the NLRB granted the union's motion for summary judgment, found the Ranch's refusal to bargain unlawful and issued a bargaining order.

On appeal VOA-Minnesota argues that the exercise of jurisdiction by the Board poses a significant risk of entanglement with the VOA's religious tenets and, therefore, jurisdiction may not be exercised because there has been no affirmative expression by Congress that the NLRB should exercise jurisdiction over religious institutions such as the Ranch. Further, the VOA argues that the exercise of jurisdiction, even if properly asserted by the NLRB, violates the "establishment" and "free exercise" clauses of the first amendment.

Congress intended to grant the NLRB the broadest possible jurisdiction permitted by the Constitution. *NLRB v. St. Louis Christian Home,* 663 F.2d 60, 62 (8th Cir. 1981) (*Christian Home*). The Board may exercise jurisdiction over all employers except those expressly excluded by the Act, *e.g.*, the United States, states or political subdivisions, 29 U.S.C. § 152(2), or those excluded under the Board's discretionary jurisdictional standards expressed as a minimum level of gross

annual revenues. *Id.* § 164(c)(1). The Ranch admits that it comes within the statutory definition of "employer" and is engaged in interstate commerce.

The VOA-Minnesota bases its claim for exclusion on *NLRB v. Catholic Bishop,* 440 U.S. 490 (1979) (*Catholic Bishop*), wherein the Supreme Court held that the NLRB had improperly exercised jurisdiction over Catholic parochial schools operated by the Catholic Bishop of Chicago. The VOA emphasizes the similarity between the Chicago parochial schools and the Ranch: (1) both are operated by recognized churches, (2) both are means by which the religion of the church is made known to others, and (3) the employees of the Ranch and the Chicago parochial schools are involved in the religious instruction of children.

These arguments are without merit. Similar arguments were rejected in *Christian Home,* 663 F.2d 60, and *Denver Post v. NLRB,* 732 F.2d 769 (10th Cir. 1984) (NLRB properly exercised jurisdiction over VOA residential and out-patient social services programs). This court held in *Christian Home* that "church operation, although important, constituted but one of many features which considered together" would indicate potential first amendment problems. 663 F.2d at 63. We held that the Christian Home, a child care facility operated by the Christian Church, was essentially secular in operation and differed significantly from parochial schools. Notably, the Christian Home received funds primarily from government sources, admitted children and hired staff without regard to religion, and only provided Christian Church services with the consent of the parents. *Id.* at 64.

The evidence demonstrates that the Ranch, like the Christian Home, differs from a parochial school. Although the VOA may view the Ranch as a vehicle for its religious missionary activities, the Ranch resembles a secular institution in critical aspects. The Ranch has as its primary purpose the care of

children, not the propagation of faith. The Ranch is operated by the VOA-Minnesota, a church, but there are no ministers on staff at the Ranch. The lay staff is chosen without regard to religious beliefs or affiliations and does not propagate the tenets of the VOA. The staff does not conduct religious classes or services and does not attempt to persuade children to accept VOA sectarian doctrines. Religious services are conducted at the Ranch by ministers of various denominations from the community.

The Ranch and its employees perform essentially secular functions. This is in contrast to the parochial schools in *Catholic Bishop* where the religious character of the schools existed at all three levels: the church had a religious purpose in establishing the schools, the schools had a religious purpose, and the teachers were mandated to propagate sectarian doctrines. As we said in *Christian Home,* "[i]t is the commitment of the faculty to religious values ... and the obligation to propagate those values which provide the risk of entanglement." This purpose and function is absent in the Ranch. 663 F.2d at 64 n.5, *citing NLRB v. Bishop Ford Central Catholic High School,* 623 F.2d 818, 822 (2d Cir. 1980), *cert. denied,* 450 U.S. 996 (1981).

The VOA-Minnesota argues that its religious commitment to serve as many children as possible will bring it into conflict with the union, which wants to enhance the economic well-being of its members.[1] Further, the VOA envisions the NLRB intervening where a staff person has been disciplined for not carrying out a duty related to the VOA religious tenets. We do not believe that the VOA-Minnesota has demonstrated that such is likely to occur or that their sectarian objectives for the Ranch will be impaired. Inquiry by the NLRB need not intrude on any activity substantially religious in character. The VOA-Minnesota's speculation that sectarian objectives will be impaired is insufficient to deprive the NLRB of jurisdiction. *St. Elizabeth Community Hospital v. NLRB*, 626 F.2d 123, 129 (9th Cir. 1980).

The NLRB's assertion of jurisdiction over the Ranch does not pose a significant risk of entanglement and does not violate the free exercise clause or the establishment clause of the first amendment. We therefore need not decide whether Congress

---

[1] The VOA-Minnesota in oral argument cited as supportive of its position this court's characterization of the collective bargaining process as "confrontational and adversarial." *Donovan v. Tony & Susan Alamo Foundation*, 722 F.2d 397, 403 (8th Cir. 1983) *(Alamo), cert. granted*, 53 U.S.L.W. 3285 (U.S. Oct. 16, 1984) (No. 83-1935). The VOA argues that confrontation between VOA and the union and the subsequent intervention by the Board will inevitably result in the Board becoming excessively entangled with VOA religious tenets.

Alamo involved the applicability of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) to persons who received lodging, food, transportation, and medical care in exchange for working in thirty commercial businesses operated by a religious foundation engaged in evangelism. Collective bargaining was described in *Alamo* as confrontational and adversarial only to demonstrate that the application of the FLSA to a religious organization did not present the same risk of entanglement as was present in the collective bargaining in *NLRB v. Catholic Bishop*, 440 U.S. 490 (1979). We did not hold that the confrontational quality of collective bargaining deprives the NLRB of jurisdiction over religiously-affiliated organizations. Each case must be examined to determine if there is excessive entanglement.

expressed an "affirmative intention" to confer jurisdiction. Accordingly, we enforce the NLRB's order requiring the Ranch to bargain collectively with the union.

A true copy.

ATTEST:

CLERK, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT

ZHDe

269 NLRB No. 176

D—1383
Anoka, MN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA—MINNESOTA-BAR NONE BOYS RANCH

and Case 18—CA—8542

TEAMSTERS LOCAL NO. 638, AFFILIATED WITH INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WAREHOUSEMEN AND HELPERS OF AMERICA

DECISION AND ORDER

Upon a charge filed by the Union 1 December 1983, the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board issued a complaint 5 December 1983 against the Respondent, alleging that it has violated Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the National Labor Relations Act.

The complaint alleges that on 6 October 1983, following a Board election in Case 18—RC—13483, the Union was certified as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of the Respondent's employees in the unit found appropriate. (Official notice is taken of the "record" in the representation proceeding as defined in the Board's Rules and Regulations, Secs. 102.68 and 102.69(g), amended Sept. 9, 1981, 46 Fed. Reg. 45922 (1981); *Frontier Hotel*, 265 NLRB No. 46 (Nov. 9, 1982).) The complaint further alleges that since 20 October

1983 the Respondent has refused to bargain with the Union. On 15 December 1983 the Respondent filed its answer admitting in part and denying in part the allegations in the complaint.

On 11 January 1984 the General Counsel filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. On 19 January 1984 the Board issued an order transferring the proceeding to the Board and a Notice to Show Cause why the motion should not be granted. The Respondent filed a response.

The National Labor Relations Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to a three-member panel.

Ruling on Motion for Summary Judgment

In its response to the Motion for Summary Judgment, the Respondent argues that the National Labor Relations Board does not have jurisdiction over it because the Volunteers of America is a religious church engaged primarily in a religious mission. In his Decision and Direction of Election, issued 1 September 1983, in the representation proceeding,[1] the Acting Regional Director for Region 18 concluded that jurisdiction should be asserted over the Respondent. He determined that the Respondent is an unincorporated nonprofit unit of the National Society of Volunteers of America (the National Society). He further determined that the Respondent provides an essentially secular charitable service in a nonsectarian manner; that patient eligibility and employee hiring for the Respondent are without regard to religious affiliation; that the employees in the petitioned-for unit are not required to join the National Society; and that their duties do not include propagation of the National Society's substantive religious convictions. By telegram dated 28 September 1983, the Board denied Respondent's Request for Review.

It is well settled that in the absence of newly discovered and previously unavailable evidence or special circumstances, a respondent in a proceeding alleging a violation of Section

[1] The hearing in the representation case was held 19 August 1983.

8(a)(5) is not entitled to relitigate issues that were or could have been litigated in a prior representation proceeding. See *Pittsburgh Glass Co. v. NLRB*, 313 U.S. 146, 162 (1941); Secs. 102.67(f) and 102.69(c) of the Board's Rules and Regulations.

All issues raised by the Respondent were or could have been litigated in the prior representation proceeding. The Respondent does not offer to adduce any newly discovered and previously unavailable evidence. Nor does it allege any special circumstances that would require the Board to reexamine the decision made in the representation proceeding. We therefore find that the Respondent has not raised any issue that is properly litigable in this unfair labor practice proceeding. Accordingly we grant the Motion for Summary Judgment.

On the entire record, the Board makes the following

Findings of Fact

I. Jurisdiction

The Respondent, an unincorporated nonprofit unit of the National Society of Volunteers of America, which is an incorporated, nonprofit, religious. and charitable organization, operates a coeducational residential treatment facility for children and adolescents with emotional, neurological, and developmental difficulties at its facility in Anoka, Minnesota. During the 12-month period ending 30 June 1983, the Respondent derived gross revenues in excess of $500,000, of which approximately $100,000 came directly from sources outside the State of Minnesota. We find that the Respondent is an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act and that the Union is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

II. Alleged Unfair Labor Practices

A. The Certification

Following the election held 29 September 1983 the Union

was certified 6 October 1983 as the collective-bargaining representative of the employees in the following appropriate unit:

> All full-time and regular part-time maintenance, laundry, housekeeping and childcare workers employed by the Employer at its facility located at 22426 St. Francis Boulevard, Anoka, Minnesota; excluding office clerical employees, professional employees, managerial employees, confidential employees, and guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

The Union continues to be the exclusive representative under Section 9(a) of the Act.

B. Refusal to Bargain

Since 19 October 1983 the Union has requested the Respondent to bargain, and since 20 October 1983 the Respondent has refused. We find that this refusal constitutes an unlawful refusal to bargain in violation of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act.

Conclusions of Law

By refusing on and after 20 October 1983 to bargain with the Union as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of employees in the appropriate unit, the Respondent has engaged in unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 8(e)(5) and (1) and Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

Remedy

Having found that the Respondent has violated Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act, we shall order it to cease and desist, to bargain on request with the Union and, if an understanding is reached, to embody the understanding in a signed agreement.

To ensure that the employees are accorded the services of their selected bargaining agent for the period provided by law, we shall construe the initial period of the certification as beginning the date the Respondent begins to bargain in good faith with the Union. *Mar-Jac Poultry Co.*, 136 NLRB 785

(1962); *Lamar Hotel*, 140 NLRB 226, 229 (1962), enfd. 328 F.2d 600 (5th Cir. 1964), cert. denied 379 U.S. 817 (1964); *Burnett Construction Co.*, 149 NLRB 1419, 1421 (1964), enfd. 350 F.2d 57 (10th Cir. 1965).

ORDER

The National Labor Relations Board orders that the Respondent, Volunteers of America—Minnesota-Bar None Boys Ranch, Anoka, Minnesota, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall

1. Cease and desist from

(a) Refusing to bargain with Teamsters Local No. 638, affiliated with International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America as the exclusive bargaining representative of the employees in the bargaining unit.

(b) In any like or related manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them by Section 7 of the Act.

2. Take the following affirmative action necessary to effectuate the policies of the Act.

(a) On request, bargain with the Union as the exclusive representative of the employees in the following appropriate unit on terms and conditions of employment and, if an understanding is reached, embody the understanding in a signed agreement;

> All full-time and regular part-time maintenance, laundry, housekeeping and childcare workers employed by the Employer at its facility located at 22426 St. Francis Boulevard, Anoka, Minnesota; excluding office clerical employees, professional employees, managerial employees, confidential employees, and guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

(b) Post at its facility in Anoka, Minnesota, copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix."[2] Copies of the notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 18, after being signed by the Respondent's authorized representative, shall be posted by the Respondent immediately upon receipt and maintained for 60 consecutive days in conspicuous places including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken by the Respondent to ensure that the notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material.

(c) Notify the Regional Director in writing within 20 days from the date of this Order what steps the Respondent has taken to comply.

Dated, Washington, D.C.

17 April 1984

Don A. Zimmerman, Member

Robert P. Hunter, Member

Patricia Diaz Dennis, Member

(SEAL) NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

[2] If this Order is enforced by a judgment of a United States Court of Appeals, the words in the notice reading "POSTED BY ORDER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD" shall read "POSTED PURSUANT TO A JUDGMENT OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS ENFORCING AN ORDER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD."

APPENDIX

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES

POSTED BY ORDER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

An Agency of the United States Government

The National Labor Relations Board has found that we violated the National Labor Relations Act and has ordered us to post and abide by this notice.

WE WILL NOT refuse to bargain with Teamsters Local No. 638, affiliated with the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America as the exclusive representative of the employees in the bargaining unit.

WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce you in the exercise of the rights guaranteed you by Section 7 of the Act.

WE WILL, on request, bargain with the Union and put in writing and sign any agreement reached on terms and conditions of employment for our employees in the bargaining unit:

> All full-time and regular part-time maintenance, laundry, housekeeping and childcare workers employed by the Employer at its facility located at 22426 St. Francis Boulevard, Anoka, Minnesota; excluding office clerical employees, professional employees, managerial employees, confidential employees, and guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA—MINNESOTA-
BAR NONE BOYS RANCH

(Employer)

Dated _____ By _____

(Representative) (Title)

THIS IS AN OFFICIAL NOTICE AND MUST NOT BE DEFACED BY ANYONE.

This notice must remain posted for 60 consecutive days from the date of posting and must not be altered, defaced, or covered by any other material. Any questions concerning this notice or compliance with its provisions may be directed to the Board's Office, Federal Building, Room 316, 110 South Fourth Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401, Telephone 612-725-2615.

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAY 24 1985
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS,
CLERK

No. 84-1623

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1984

VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA—MINNESOTA—BAR NONE BOYS RANCH, PETITIONER

v.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD IN OPPOSITION

REX E. LEE
Solicitor General
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202) 633-2217

ROSEMARY M. COLLYER
General Counsel

JOHN E. HIGGINS, JR.
Deputy General Counsel

ROBERT E. ALLEN
Associate General Counsel

NORTON J. COME
Deputy Associate General Counsel

LINDA SHER
Assistant General Counsel

ROBERT C. BELL, JR.
Attorney
National Labor Relations Board
Washington, D.C. 20570

25 pp

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether the Board is empowered by the National Labor Relations Act to assert jurisdiction over a religiously affiliated residential treatment facility for handicapped children and to require it to bargain with the union selected in a Board-conducted election as the representative of the maintenance, laundry, housekeeping, and childcare workers employed by the facility.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Opinions below	1
Jurisdiction	1
Constitutional provision and statute involved	1
Statement	2
Argument	6
Conclusion	13
Appendix	1a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

Denver Post of the National Society of the Volunteers of America v. *NLRB*, 732 F.2d 769 10

Lemon v. *Kurtzman*, 403 U.S. 602 8

NLRB v. *Bishop Ford Central Catholic High School*, 632 F.2d 818, cert. denied, U.S. 996 8

NLRB v. *Catholic Bishop*, 440 U.S. 490 ..... 5, 6, 7-8, 9, 10, 11, 12

NLRB v. *Reliance Fuel Oil Corp.*, 371 U.S. 224 7

NLRB v. *St. Louis Christian Home*, 663 F.2d 60 ..... 8, 10

NLRB v. *World Evangelism, Inc.*, 656 F.2d 1349 11

Salt & Pepper Nursery School & Kindergarten No. 2, 222 N.L.R.B. 1295 7

Page

Cases—Continued:

St. Elizabeth Hospital v. *NLRB*, 715 F.2d 1193 12

St. Elizabeth Community Hospital v. *NLRB*, 708 F.2d 1436 12

Tony & Susan Alamo Foundation v. *Secretary of Labor*, No. 83-1935 (Apr. 23, 1985) 9-10

Tressler Lutheran Home for Children v. *NLRB*, 677 F.2d 302 ..... 10-11, 12

Walz v. *Tax Commission*, 397 U.S. 664 10

Constitution and statutes:

U.S. Const. Amend. I 1, 2, 5, 8

Commerce Clause 7

Religion Clauses 6

National Labor Relations Act, 29 U.S.C. 151 *et seq.* 1, 2

§ 2(2), 29 U.S.C. 152(2) 7

§ 8(a)(1), 29 U.S.C. 158(a)(1) 5

§ 8(a)(5), 29 U.S.C. 158(a)(5) 5

Miscellaneous:

Esbeck, *Establishment Clause Limits on Governmental Interference with Religious Organizations*, 41 Wash. & Lee L. Rev. 347 (1984) 11

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1984

No. 84-1623

VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA—MINNESOTA—BAR NONE BOYS RANCH, PETITIONER

v.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD IN OPPOSITION

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the court of appeals (Pet. App. 1-8) is reported at 752 F.2d 345. The decision and order of the National Labor Relations Board (Pet. App. 9-16) are reported at 269 N.L.R.B. 1049. The decision of the Board's Regional Director (App., *infra*, 1a-6a) in the underlying representation proceeding is not reported.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on January 15, 1985. The petition for a writ of certiorari was filed on April 15, 1985. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION AND STATUTE INVOLVED

The First Amendment to the United States Constitution and relevant provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, 29 U.S.C. 151 *et seq.*, are set forth at Pet. 2.

STATEMENT

1. Petitioner Volunteers of America-Minnesota operates the Bar None Boys Ranch, a residential treatment facility for children with emotional, neurological, and developmental problems (App., *infra*, 5a n.2). The Union[1] filed a petition with the Board in July 1983 for a representation election in a unit consisting of the facility's maintenance, laundry, housekeeping and childcare workers. In response, petitioner contended that it is a religious organization; that it operates the Ranch as part of its religious mission; and that the Board's assertion of jurisdiction is impermissible under the National Labor Relations Act, 29 U.S.C. 151 *et seq.*, and the First Amendment because it poses a danger of excessive governmental entanglement with religion. App., *infra*, 5a n.2.

Following a hearing, the Board's Regional Director found that the Volunteers of America (VOA) is a national non-profit religious organization founded in 1896 and modeled after the Salvation Army. The national organization is divided into [illegible] regions, which in turn comprise state organizations called posts (App., *infra*, 5a n.2). VOA's stated purpose is "to provide an intimate knowledge of God to all the people we serve and to provide services that would uplift and reach these people" (Tr. 15).[2] As Reverend Jack Dignun, Midwest regional director of the VOA, explained (Tr. 15-16), the founder of VOA "had a philosophy * * * that you can't talk to a person when he is hungry or when he is cold. Therefore, our religion [*sic*] ministry is to provide for the material needs of the needy individual, at the same time we are providing for humanitarian services, we are also

---

[1]Teamsters Local No. 683, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America.

[2]"Tr." references are to the transcript of the hearing conducted by the Board's Regional Office.

espousing our religious beliefs. Providing knowledge of God to the people we serve." Accordingly, the VOA operates a variety of humanitarian service programs for people in need, including the Bar None Boys Ranch, which is administered through its Minnesota Post.

The VOA resembles a traditional church in that it has a body of religious tenets (Tr. 26, 30-37; 40-42) to which its ministers are required to subscribe (Tr. 40-42) and performs sacraments of marriage, baptism, "the Lord's supper," and burial according to prescribed forms (Tr. 26, 27). It has well prescribed forms for worship and the "enrollment service is for enrolling people into our church" (Tr. 27). It is a distinctive feature of the VOA that it does not necessarily seek to enroll individuals as members of its own organization but is content to "bring [persons] back to God and return them to their own churches. If they did not have a church, then they could become members of the VOA church proper" (Tr. 64). Prior to May 1983 officers of the VOA national organization held titles analogous to military ranks (perhaps as a reflection of the original relation of the VOA to the Salvation Army); since that time officers have been referred to as "ministers." Applicants for these positions must sign a covenant pledging commitment to the national organization and its religious and other tenets. They are licensed and ordained at an annual conference of the national organization after one to three years of primarily self-study. App., *infra,* 5a n.2.

The Bar None Boys Ranch provides special education and residential treatment for emotionally disturbed children, and more intensive treatment for autistic and other developmentally retarded children (Tr. 48-49). The Ranch's chief source of income is state or local governments that place children at the facility for treatment (Tr. 57-59). The Ranch Director has overall responsibility for the services provided, and the Ranch's Program Director is responsible

for the facility's internal operations (Tr. 46-48, 60). Neither the Director nor the Program Director is a minister in the VOA, and there is no evidence that any VOA ministers work at the Ranch (App., *infra*, 5a-6a n.2; Tr. 47, 60-63). Larry Weight, the Program Director at the Ranch, testified that religion is "an integral part" of its program, that the employees are "told about the VOA church when they are applying and taken through the orientation process," that they are required to review the VOA manual, that "[t]hey are required by their job to carry out [the VOA] religious mission," and that "they are evaluated on how well they carry out the VOA religious mission" (Tr. 61-62). Neither the Union nor any of the unit employees offered testimony at the hearing.

On the basis of the evidence adduced at the hearing the Board's Regional Director concluded (App., *infra*, 6a n.2):

> [A]lthough the Employer is, or is affiliated with, a religious organization, the record discloses that the Bar None Boys Ranch provides an essentially secular charitable service in a non-sectarian manner; that eligibility to participate as a resident of the ranch is determined without regard to religious affiliation; that the employees in the unit petitioned for herein are hired without regard to religious affiliation; that the employees in the unit petitioned for herein are not required to join the national organization; [and] that the duties of these employees do not include the propagation of the national organization's substantive religious convictions.

Accordingly, the Regional Director found that the Board had jurisdiction over the Ranch and directed that an election be held on the Union's petition (App., *infra*, 1a-3a). The Board denied petitioner's request for review of the Regional Director's decision and, following an election in which the Union was selected by a majority of unit employees, the

Union was certified as exclusive bargaining representative of the unit employees (Pet. App. 11-12).

2. Petitioner refused to recognize and bargain with the Union and the Union filed an unfair labor practice charge. The Board's General Counsel issued a complaint and moved for summary judgment on the ground that all issues relevant to the unfair labor practice charge were, or could have been, litigated in the representation proceeding. The Board granted summary judgment, finding that petitioner violated Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act, 29 U.S.C. 158(a)(5) and (1), and ordered petitioner to recognize and bargain with the Union as representative of the unit employees. Pet. App. 8-16.

3. The court of appeals enforced the Board's order. The court rejected petitioner's contention that the Board's assertion of jurisdiction was improper under *NLRB* v. *Catholic Bishop*, 440 U.S. 490 (1979), in which this Court had held that the Act did not authorize the Board's assertion of jurisdiction over teachers in church-operated schools.[3] The court of appeals stated (Pet. App. 5-6):

> The evidence demonstrates that the Ranch * * * differs from a parochial school. Although the VOA may view the Ranch as a vehicle for its religious missionary activities, the Ranch resembles a secular institution in critical aspects. The Ranch has as its primary purpose the care of children, not the propagation of faith. * * * [T]here are no ministers on staff at the Ranch. The lay staff is chosen without regard to religious beliefs or affiliations and does not propagate the

---

[3]Because it determined that the Board's assertion of jurisdiction over teachers in church-operated schools would raise serious First Amendment questions, the Court required a "clear expression of an affirmative intention of Congress that [such] teachers * * * should be covered by the Act." 440 U.S. at 504, 507.

> tenets of the VOA. The staff does not conduct religious classes or services and does not attempt to persuade children to accept VOA sectarian doctrines.
>
> * * * * *
>
> This is in contrast to the parochial schools in *Catholic Bishop* where the religious character of the schools existed at all three levels: the church had a religious purpose in establishing the schools, the schools had a religious purpose, and the teachers were mandated to propagate sectarian doctrines.

Accordingly, the court found that the Board's exercise of jurisdiction "need not intrude on any activity substantially religious in character" and "does not pose a significant risk of entanglement" (Pet. App. 7). Unlike in *Catholic Bishop*, there was no need to find that Congress had "expressed an 'affirmative intention' to confer jurisdiction" (Pet. App. 8).

ARGUMENT

Petitioner invokes the principle of *NLRB* v. *Catholic Bishop*, 440 U.S. 490 (1979), which both states a significant limitation on the reach of the Board's jurisdiction as a matter of statutory interpretation and adumbrates the application of the protection of religious liberty contained in the Religion Clauses of the First Amendment to relationships between the Board and employers of a religious character. On this underlying principle there is no disagreement. The problem presented here is one of application of the principle to a particular set of facts. To be sure, unsympathetic interpretation and fact-finding in some cases could, if unreviewed, erode the legal principle and protection reflected in *Catholic Bishop*; however, the record in this case is so sparse and devoid of relevant specifics as to present an inappropriately abstract and hypothetical occasion for clarifying the boundaries established by *Catholic Bishop*. Accordingly, we urge the Court to deny the petition for certiorari.

1. Petitioner does not dispute that it falls within the statutory definition of employers over which the Board has jurisdiction under the Act. And further it does not dispute that it meets the Board's discretionary monetary standards for asserting jurisdiction. Section 2(2) of the Act, 29 U.S.C. 152(2), covers all employers not within eight express exceptions; there is no exception for religiously-oriented or other private nonprofit organizations. However, in the exercise of its discretion, the Board will decline to assert its legal jurisdiction over day care centers and institutions providing specialized care and custody of children unless their gross annual revenues total $250,000 or more. See *Salt & Pepper Nursery School & Kindergarten No. 2*, 222 N.L.R.B. 1295 (1976). The Ranch has annual revenues in excess of $500,000, of which approximately $100,000 comes directly from sources outside the State of Minnesota (App., *infra*, 5a n.2).

While in passing the Act, Congress intended to and did vest in the Board the fullest jurisdictional breadth constitutionally permissible under the Commerce Clause (see *NLRB* v. *Reliance Fuel Oil Corp.*, 371 U.S. 224, 226 (1963)), it was the explicit purpose of *Catholic Bishop* to "decline to construe the Act in a manner that could in turn call upon the Court to resolve difficult and sensitive questions arising out of the guarantees of the First Amendment Religion Clauses." 440 U.S. at 507. These questions are necessarily anchored in specific facts regarding the religious functions of the employer and the duties of the employees.

In *Catholic Bishop*, this Court found that the Board's assertion of jurisdiction over teachers in Roman Catholic parochial schools posed a significant risk of "entanglement with the religious mission of the school." 440 U.S. at 502. The Court relied on both " 'the admitted and obvious fact that the *raison d'etre* of parochial schools is the propagation

of a religious faith' " (*id.* at 503)[4] and the "critical and unique role of the teacher in fulfilling the mission of a church-operated school" by transmitting religious doctrine to students (*id.* at 501). Accordingly, the Court, applying its prudential policy of construing an Act of Congress to avoid a serious constitutional question, if possible, looked to see whether there was a "clear expression of an affirmative intention of Congress that teachers in church-operated schools should be covered by the Act" (*id.* at 504); and, finding no such "clear expression of Congress' intent" (*id.* at 507), it concluded that they were not covered.

The situation here appears to be distinguishable. The Board found (see pages 4-5, *supra*) that the VOA does not attempt to propagate any particular religious faith; individuals are eligible to receive the Ranch's services without regard to their religious affiliation; employees are hired by the Ranch without regard to religion and are not required to join or subscribe to VOA's tenets; and neither the Ranch's management nor its employees are involved in the propagation of any particular substantive religious doctrine. On these facts, the court below concluded that the Ranch and its maintenance, laundry, housekeeping, and childcare workers[5]—

---

[4]Quoting *Lemon* v. *Kurtzman*, 403 U.S. 602, 628 (1971) (Douglas, J., concurring). The First Amendment conflict in *Catholic Bishop* arose from "the suffusion of religion into the curriculum and the mandate of the faculty to infuse the students with the religious values of a religious creed." *NLRB* v. *Bishop Ford Central Catholic High School*, 623 F.2d 818, 823 (2d Cir. 1980), cert. denied, 450 U.S. 996 (1981).

[5]Although the record does not reveal the precise job functions of unit employees known as "childcare workers," it is clear that they are not professionals, because professional employees were expressly excluded from the unit (App., *infra*, 2a, 6a n.3). Moreover, their inclusion in a unit with maintenance, laundry, and housekeeping employees supports the inference that they perform basic, essentially physical tasks in caring for children at the Ranch. See *NLRB* v. *St. Louis Christian Home*, 663 F.2d 60, 62 (8th Cir. 1981) (childcare workers at center for abused children were required to be over 21, have a high school degree, and be able to prepare meals and administer prescribed medication).

the only employees at issue here—had as their primary function "the care of children, not the propagation of faith" (Pet. App. 5-6); that the Board's assertion of jurisdiction over the Ranch "does not pose a significant risk of entanglement" (*id.* at 7), unlike that presented in *Catholic Bishop*; and hence that there was no need to make a special inquiry as to "whether Congress expressed an 'affirmative intention' to confer jurisdiction" (Pet. App. 7-8). There is no question that, under the principles usually applied in determining the Act's coverage, the Ranch and the employees here would be covered.

2. Petitioner asserts (Pet. 4-5) that for its religious organization, service to others *is* the exercise of a religious mission, and that by performing such service its employees are teaching by example the tenets of its faith. In the context of this sparse record these claims are difficult to evaluate. Certainly it does not count against petitioner's claims that members of the VOA do not seek to win additional members to their particular church organization, except where an individual—whether employee or person under their care—has no previous religious faith to return to. Although unusually ecumenical, such a posture does not preclude petitioner's mission from being characterized as entirely religious in character. The difficulty here is of a different order. It is not clear from this record whether the religious function envisaged for the unit employees entails anything more than the faithful discharge of their secular duties. This seems especially improbable with respect to the maintenance, laundry, and housekeeping workers.[6] Assuming it does not, the case would present circumstances analogous to

---

[6]In *Catholic Bishop*, only teachers, whose duties included propagation of religious teaching, were held exempt from the Board's jurisdiction. Janitorial staff of religious institutions, for example, are unquestionably covered.

those recently considered by this Court in *Tony & Susan Alamo Foundation* v. *Secretary of Labor,* No. 83-1935, (Apr. 23, 1985). There, the Court rejected a claim that work in purely commercial enterprises carried out by a religious organization was constitutionally exempt from secular governmental regulation merely because the organization considered such work a form of religious service. The Court held (slip op. 8) that "objectively ascertainable facts concerning the nature and scope" of the activities—not self-definition—were controlling.

In this case the activities are located in what we have identified as the "difficult middle ground" of a church's social ministry, in which it is engaged neither in core religious functions on one hand, nor ordinary businesses on the other (Gov't Br. at 14) in *Tony & Susan Alamo Foundation* v. *Secretary of Labor, supra*; see also *Walz* v. *Tax Commission*, 397 U.S. 664, 674 (1970)). Where that social ministry is carried out in very much the same way as by a secular charitable organization and the religious origin of the mission provides no more than a motive for engaging in that work, courts have not found governmental regulation to present a special risk of intrusion on religious liberty. *NLRB* v. *St. Louis Christian Home*, 663 F.2d 60 (8th Cir., 1981); *Denver Post of the National Society of the Volunteers of America* v. *NLRB*, 732 F.2d 769 (10th Cir. 1984).[7] Similarly, even if a church's charitable activities are sufficiently suffused by a religious element as to invoke constitutional immunities for some purposes, this would not necessarily immunize all aspects of the activity from every kind of

---

[7]Indeed in 1974 Congress extended the reach of the Labor Act to non-profit health care institutions with full awareness that many such institutions were church-related and that many persons thus brought under the Board's jurisdiction were working in part in fulfillment of a sense of religious obligation. See *NLRB* v. *Catholic Bishop*, 440 U.S. at 514-516 (Brennan, J., dissenting).

regulation. See *Tressler Lutheran Home for Children* v. *NLRB*, 677 F.2d 302 (3d Cir. 1982) (Board's jurisdiction upheld as to service and maintenance employees, nursing and physiotherapy assistants, clerks, orderlies, dietary, housekeeping, and laundry employees, and practical nurses at a church affiliated nursing home); *NLRB* v. *World Evangelism, Inc.*, 656 F.2d 1349 (9th Cir. 1981) (Board's jurisdiction upheld as to engineers at hotel, office, and convention center owned by a religious organization); Esbeck, *Establishment Clause Limits on Governmental Interference with Religious Organizations*, 41 Wash. & Lee L. Rev. 347 (1984).

3. Petitioner also makes more troublesome claims that the Ranch was engaged in a specifically and distinctly religious mission (Tr. 61), that the employees were expected to transmit the religious precepts of the VOA (Tr. 61), that they were trained to transmit the organization's religious values, and that they were evaluated on that basis (Tr. 62). Presumably, these claims have particular reference to the childcare workers (but see note 5, *supra*). Certainly a children's home devoted to inculcating religious principles and determined to govern its personnel selection, training, discipline, and evaluation with this end in view would present serious claims to exemption from Labor Board jurisdiction under *Catholic Bishop*, at least with respect to some employees.

In this particular case, however, the testimony supporting petitioner's claim is far too conclusory and general to permit a conscientious examination of the claim. The record does not reveal, for instance, how many of the bargaining unit members are childcare workers and how many are laundry, housekeeping, and maintenance workers. Nor does it define the specific duties of the childcare workers, the precise nature of the religious values they are supposed to promote, or the way in which they (in contrast, for instance, to laundry workers) are expected to transmit those values to

the children in their care. If they do so merely by the example of kindness and devotion to their work—*i.e.*, as "role models," as the hearing officer determined was apparently the case (App., *infra*, 6a n.2)—then the court of appeals was correct in finding no entanglement worries sufficient to bring this case under *Catholic Bishop*.

Even petitioner's contention (Pet. 6) that employees actually engage in religious activity by participating in the Ranch's chapel committee is insufficiently developed to permit proper evaluation. Although the court of appeals stated that the chapel committee "takes part in planning the spiritual and religious aspects of the program at the Ranch" (Pet. App. 3), the record does not make clear what role the childcare workers play in this aspect of the Ranch's function. The Ranch has a full-time religious director (Tr. 39), and a significant portion of the religious teaching and worship is conducted by outside churches (Tr. 53, 54-55). So far as the record reveals, this aspect of the Ranch's operation does not distinguish it from similar secular institutions that recognize the therapeutic or spiritual value of religious services and make such services available to those who request them. See *St. Elizabeth Hospital* v. *NLRB*, 715 F.2d 1193, 1196 (7th Cir. 1983); *St. Elizabeth Community Hospital* v. *NLRB*, 708 F.2d 1436, 1441 (9th Cir. 1983); *Tressler Lutheran Home for Children* v. *NLRB*, 677 F.2d at 305.

In sum, because of the sparseness of the record, there was insufficient basis for the court of appeals to decline to enforce the Board's order. Any evaluation of the issues in this case by this Court would be inappropriately abstract and hypothetical.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted.

REX E. LEE
Solicitor General

ROSEMARY M. COLLYER
General Counsel

JOHN E. HIGGINS, JR.
Deputy General Counsel

ROBERT E. ALLEN
Associate General Counsel

NORTON J. COME
Deputy Associate General Counsel

LINDA SHER
Assistant General Counsel

ROBERT C. BELL, JR.
Attorney
National Labor Relations Board

MAY 1985

DOJ-1985-05

APPENDIX

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA--MINNESOTA--BAR NONE BOYS RANCH[1]

Employer

and

TEAMSTERS LOCAL NO. 638, affiliated with INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WAREHOUSEMEN AND HELPERS OF AMERICA

Petitioner

Case No. 18-RC-13483

DECISION AND DIRECTION OF ELECTION

Upon a petition duly filed under Section 9(c) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, a hearing was held before a hearing officer of the National Labor Relations Board, hereinafter referred to as the Board.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 3(b) of the Act, the Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to the undersigned.

Upon the entire record in this proceeding, the undersigned finds:

1. The hearing officer's rulings made at the hearing are free from prejudicial error and are hereby affirmed.

2. The Employer is engaged in commerce within the meaning of the Act and it will effectuate the purpose of the Act to assert jurisdiction herein.[2]

3. The labor organization(s) involved claim(s) to represent certain employees of the Employer.

4. A question affecting commerce exists concerning the representation of certain employees of the Employer within the meaning of Section 9(c)(1) and Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

5. The following employees of the Employer constitute a unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining within the meaning of Section 9(b) of the Act:[3]

> All full-time and regular part-time maintenance, laundry, housekeeping and childcare workers employed by the Employer at its facility located at 22426 St. Francis Boulevard, Anoka, Minnesota; excluding office clerical employees, professional employees, managerial employees, confidential employees, and guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

DIRECTION OF ELECTION

An election by secret ballot shall be conducted by the undersigned among the employees in the unit(s) found appropriate at the time and place set forth in the notice of election to be issued subsequently, subject to the Board's Rules and Regulations. Eligible to vote are those in the unit(s) who were employed during the payroll period ending immediately preceding the date of this Decision, including employees who did not work during that period because they were ill, on vacation, or temporarily laid off. Also eligible are employees engaged in an economic strike which commenced less than 12 months before the election date and who retained their status as such during the eligibility period and their replacements. Those in the military service of the United States may vote if they appear in person at the polls. Ineligible to vote are employees who have quit or been discha ged for cause since the designated payroll period, employees engaged in a strike who have been discharged for

cause since the commencement thereof and who have not been rehired or reinstated before the election date, and employees engaged in an economic strike which commenced more than 12 months before the election date and who have been permanently replaced. Those eligible shall vote whether or not they desire to be represented for collective bargaining purposes by TEAMSTERS LOCAL NO. 638, affiliated with INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WAREHOUSEMEN AND HELPERS OF AMERICA.

LIST OF VOTERS

In order to ensure that all eligible voters may have the opportunity to be informed of the issues in the exercise of their statutory right to vote, all parties to the election should have access to a list of voters and their addresses which may be used to communicate with them. *Excelsior Underwear, Inc.*, 156 NLRB 1236 (1966); *N.L.R.B.* v. *Wyman-Gordon Company*, 394 U.S. 759 (1969). Accordingly, it is hereby directed that within 7 days of the date of this Decision. TWO copies of an election eligibility list, containing the names and addresses of all the eligible voters, shall be filed by the Employer with the undersigned who shall make the list available to all parties to the election. In order to be timely filed, such list must be received in the Minneapolis Regional Office, 316 Federal Courts Building, 110 South 4th Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 55401 on or before September 8, 1983. No extension of time to file this list shall be granted except in extradordinary circumstances, nor shall the filing of a request for review operate to stay the requirement here imposed.

RIGHT TO REQUEST REVIEW

Under the provisions of Section 102.67 of the Board's Rules and Regulations, a request for review of this Decision may be filed with the National Labor Relations Board,

addressed to the Executive Secretary, 1717 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20570. This request must be received by the Board in Washington by September 14, 1983.

Dated September 1, 1983,

at Minneapolis, Minnesota

/s/ HERBERT S. DAWIDOFF

Acting Regional Director Region Eighteen

VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA—MINNESOTA—BAR NONE BOYS RANCH Case No. 18-RC-13483

September 1, 1983

---

[1]The name of the Employer appears as amended at the hearing.

[2]The Employer, contrary to the Petitioner, contends that the Board lacks jurisdiction herein because the Employer is a non-profit, religious organization and that assertion of jurisdiction by the Board would violate the religious clause of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

The Employer, Volunteers of America–Minnesota–Bar None Boys Ranch, is an unincorporated non-profit unit of the National Society of Volunteers of America (the "national organization"). The national organization is an incorporated, non-profit religious and charitable organization. Founded in 1896 by individuals previously associated with the Salvation Army, the national organization's stated principal purpose is to provide spiritual and material assistance to those in need. Underlying this purpose is the belief that individuals' material needs must be satisfied in order to serve their spiritual needs. Recipients of services provided by the national organization are encouraged to seek spirtual services from their own individual churches.

The national organization is divided into four regions and two national divisions, all of which are under the organization's national headquarters. All regional programs must be approved by the national organization, which has been granted tax-exempt status by both the Internal Revenue Service and the Minnesota Department of Taxation.

Officers of the national organization held ranks analogous to military ranks prior to May 1983; since May 1983, officers have been titled "ministers." Applicants for these positions must sign a convenant pledging commitment to the national organization's policies, as articulated in its constitution, by laws and articles of incorporation. They are then licensed and ordained at an annual conference of the national organization after one of three years of primarily self-study. Many of these licensed officers/ministers have been previously ordained by a religious denomination.

The Bar None Boys Ranch is a coeducational residential treatment facility for children and adolescents with emotional, neurological and developmental problems and difficulties. It has annual revenues in excess of $500,000, of which approximately $100,000 comes directly from sources outside the State of Minnesota. The ranch staff includes a

---

Director and Program Director, neither of whom is ordained by the national organization or any denomination, and a Religious Director, whose credentials and background are undisclosed in the record.

There is no indication that the employees in the unit petitioned for herein (i.e., maintenance, laundry, housekeeping and childcare workers) are members of the national organization or that membership is required as a condition of employment at the ranch. Neither does the record reveal that the religious affiliation of any of these employees is a factor in hiring decisions, although they are advised of the national organization's religious tenets upon being hired.

The Employer asserts that the employees petitioned for herein carry out the religious principles of the national organization, but the record does not indicate in what way this is done, other than the fact that the childcare workers serve on the chapel committee. The chapel committee is designed to address the "spirtual side" of the children by coordinating such activities as services provided by area churches on the Bar None Boys Ranch grounds. The religious instruction which the petitioned-for employees are said to provide appears to be limited to serving as "role models" for the children at the ranch. The religious structure of the ranch is non-denominational to the extent that any child in the facility—Christian, Jewish, Hindu or Budhist—could receive appropriate religious services upon request. Furthermore, the ability of children to receive services at the facility is not determined or limited by their religious affiliation.

In view of the foregoing and the record as a whole, I conclude that jurisdiction should be asserted herein. Thus, although the Employer is, or is affiliated with, a religious organization, the record disclose that the Bar None Boys Ranch provides an essentially secular charitable service in a non-sectarian manner; that eligibility to participate as a resident of the ranch is determined without regard to religious affiliation; that the employees in the unit petitioned for herein are hired without regard to religious affiliation; that the employees in the unit petitioned for herein are not required to join the national organization; that the duties of these employees do not include the propagation of the national organization's substantive religious convictions; and that the Employer's operations meet the Board's monetary standards for the assertion of

jurisdiction. *Harborcreek School for Boys*, 249 NLRB 1226 (1980); *Catholic Community Services*, 247 NLRB 743 (1980). See also, *Thiel College*, 261 NLRB 580 (1982), citing *Barber-Scotia College, Inc.*, 245 NLRB 406 (1979) (applicability of *N.L.R.B.* v. *Catholic Bishops of Chicago*, 440 U.S. 490 (1979) limited to parochial school teachers).

[3]The unit appears as agreed to by the parties. The parties further agreed that part-time employees who averaged four hours a week during the calendar quarter immediately preceding the payroll period for eligibility would be considered regular part-time employees and would be included in the unit.

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUN 18 1985
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS
CLERK

84-1623

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1984

VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA-MINNESOTA-
BAR NONE BOYS RANCH, *Petitioner*

v.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

REPLY BRIEF FOR VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA-MINNESOTA-BAR NONE BOYS RANCH

JOHN M. HUSBAND
(Counsel Of Record)

MICHAEL M. SHULTZ
HOLLAND & HART
555 Seventeenth Street
Suite 2900
P.O. Box 8749
Denver, Colorado 80201
(303) 295-8000
Attorneys for Petitioner

12pp

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Statement of the Case 1
Argument 2
Conclusion 11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Tony & Susan Alamo Foundation v. Secretary of Labor, No. 83-1935, 53 U.S.L.W. 4489 (April 29, 1985) 10

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This Petition for a Writ of Certiorari was filed with the Court to determine whether the National Labor Relations Act ("NLRA") grants the National Labor Relations Board ("the Board" or "NLRB") jurisdiction over the Volunteers of America ("VOA") Bar None Boys Ranch ("the Ranch") for emotionally disturbed children and adolescents when that organization is engaged in the primary religious activities of an established church. In its brief in opposition, the Board affirms its support for "the legal principle and protection reflected in *Catholic Bishop;*" however, the Board maintains that "the record in this case is so sparse and devoid of relevant specifics as to present an inappropriately abstract and hypothetical occasion for clarifying the boundaries established by *Catholic Bishop.*" Brief for the National Labor Relations Board in Opposition at 6 (hereinafter "Brief in Opposition"). The Board admits that the Petitioner's claims raise serious issues regarding the jurisdiction of the Board, but again suggests that the testimony supporting Petitioner's claims is "too conclusory and general to permit a conscientious examination of the claim." Brief in Opposition at 11.

With due respect to the Board, the record below is clear and concrete and the testimony supporting the wholly religious character of the Ranch is uncontroverted. At the representation hearing, VOA called three witnesses—Reverend Jack Dignum, Regional Director of the Volunteers of American for the Midwest Division; Verlyn Wenndt, Director of the Ranch; and Larry Weight, Program Director at the Ranch. No union witnesses were called and the union representative who attended the hearing did not cross-examine VOA's witnesses. Despite VOA's argument at the representation hearing that "the Board does not have jurisdiction over it because it is an unincorporated, non-profit religious church carrying out its religious mission," the Board issued its Decision and Direction of Election, designating all full-time and regular part-time mainte-

nance, laundry, housekeeping and childcare workers employed by the Ranch as the appropriate bargaining unit. VOA's request for review of the Board's decision was denied.

ARGUMENT

The uncontradicted testimony at the representation hearing demonstrates that the Bar None Boys Ranch is a primary religious activity of the Volunteers of America and that employees at the Ranch are engaged in carrying out the mission of the Church and are evaluated according to how well they carry out the Church's religious mission. Reverend Dignum testified that the purpose in forming the VOA "was to provide an intimate knowledge of God to all the people we serve and to provide services that would uplift and reach these people . . . . . you can't talk to a person when he is hungry or when he is cold. Therefore, our religion ministry is to provide for the material needs of the individual, at the same time we are providing for humanitarian services, we are also espousing our religious beliefs. Providing knowledge of God to the people we serve." (T.-15, 16).[1]

Reverend Dignum further testified regarding the first article of the constitution of the National Society of the Volunteers of America. He stated: "The first article says that the National Society of the Volunteers of America is a movement organized for the reaching and uplifting of all sections of the people and bring them to the immediate knowledge and active service of God." (T-26). When asked how the religious mission of the VOA was carried out, Reverend Dignum responded: "Through all of our activities. All of our program services have to fall within the articles that I am referring to here or we would not be operating." (Id.). Reverend Dignum explained that the "religious mission is carried out in all the acts that we do. In specific programming, we have the components

---

[1] References to the transcript of the underlying representation hearing will be in the form of "T.-" followed by the page number(s) on which the cited testimony can be found.

that make up the spiritual end of our activities as well as the material needs and we consider this as all part of the Christian mission. We do not have any distinction in our religion between the necessities of life that people need and the religious activities. We feel that the humanitarian activities that we are conducting directly lead the people to the immediate knowledge of God." (T-39, 40).

One unique aspect of the VOA is that it does not proselytize and attempt to recruit the people it serves to membership in the VOA. Rather, the philosophy of the VOA is that persons should be brought to the immediate knowledge of God and that they should be returned to their existing churches. If a person does not have a church, then that person may become a member of the VOA church. Thus, Reverend Dignum explained that "there is a unique, distinctive element to our church that is not found in any other church. Most churches are trying to gather members unto them. We are trying to return them to existing churches and function as a church for those people who do not have a church." (T.-64).

The Bar None Boys Ranch is operated in strict accordance with the philosophy and mission of the VOA. Reverend Dignum explained that the VOA monitors "the programs to insure that they meet our creeds and our activities that everything complies with our religious nature. This is something that they must follow or the national organization has the authority and the power to change, alter or remove any such activity that does not meet our religious creed." (T.-16). Reverend Dignum continued, "[E]verything must be in accord with the religious tenets of the organization. We very carefully review all of the program activities that are requested by any of the local branches to insure that they meet the criteria. We will not permit a program to operate that does not meet our tenet." (T.-23).

When asked whether the religious mission of the VOA is carried out at Bar None Boys Ranch, Reverend Dignum replied "yes." (T.-30). The specific reason justifying the Bar None

program, according to Reverend Dignum, is that the program "provide[s] service to adolescents and children who have spiritual, mental or physical needs." (T.-40). When asked whether the program at the Ranch constituted the propagation of the VOA religious beliefs, Reverend Dignum again replied "yes." (Id.).

The uncontroverted testimony of the three witnesses at the representation hearing demonstrates that employees at the Ranch are required to carry out the Church's mission and evaluated on how well they carry out that religious mission. Reverend Dignum gave the following testimony:

Q. Is the religious mission carried out at Bar None?

A. Yes.

Q. Are the employees at Bar None told the religious nature of the VOA?

A. Yes.

Q. Are they instructed about the religious tenets of the VOA?

A. Yes.

Q. Do the[y] review the VOA manuals?

A. Yes.

Q. Do the individual employees at Bar None carry out the religious purposes of the VOA?

A. Yes.

Q. Is religion a direct and integral part of the program at Bar None?

A. Yes, it has to be.

Q. Are the employees that carry out those programs an integral and direct part of the VOA religious mission?

A. Yes.

Q. Do the employees—are the employees evaluated on how they carry out the VOA religious mission at Bar None?

A. Yes, they are.

Q. Are the employees at Bar None required to engage in the VOA's religious mission?

A. Yes.

(T.-30, 31).

Similar testimony was given by Mr. Wenndt, Director of the Bar None Boys Ranch.

Q. Are the programs and activities at Bar None designed to carry out the religious mission of the VOA?

A. Yes.

Q. Are the employees at Bar None told that the VOA is a church?

A. Yes.

Q. And they are told that when they apply?

A. Yes.

Q. Is an orientation process involved in this?

A. Yes.

Q. During the orientation, they are advised of the VOA's religious tenets?

A. Right.

Q. Do employees review the VOA manual when they come on board?

A. Yes.

Q. During the interview process and orientation process when the employees job is explained to them, do you explain the religious nature of the job to them?

A. Yes. It's directly in their job descriptions. As in the manual given to them.

Q. They are told that they are carrying out the VOA religious mission?

A. Yes.

Q. Are the employees and workers at Bar None expected to carry out the VOA religious mission?

A. Yes.

Q. Do they, in fact, carry it out?
A. Yes.

Q. You make sure that's done?
A. Yes, through their job reviews.

Q. So the employees are evaluated on that?
A. Yes.

Q. They are specifically evaluated on how well they carry out the religious mission of the VOA?
A. Yes, on the spiritual aspects.

Q. And the employees are required to engage in religious activities?
A. Yes.

Q. And these religious activities are discussed with them at their evaluations?
A. Yes.

Q. All the employees at Bar None are employed by the church?
A. Yes.

(T.-51, 52, 53).

Finally, Mr. Weight, Program Director at the Bar None Boys Ranch, explained how employees carry out the church's mission.

Q. How do you treat the kids [at the Ranch] and what are the different components of the treatment?
A. All of the kids that are there obviously have problems. We treat them from three different standpoints, physical, emotional and spiritual. The treatment plan reflects all three of those factors.

Q. Does Bar None carry out the religious mission of the VOA?
A. Yes, it does.

Q. Is religion an integral part of the VOA Bar None programs?

A. It certainly is.

Q. How is it an integral part?

A. As I've already indicated I am involved with treatment plans and hiring, etc., I don't see any aspect of anything we're doing at Bar None that prioritizes any of those three components. They're all very important and as Reverend Dignum inidicated, certainly the spiritual is why we are there.

Q. Are the programs at Bar None designed with the religious mission in mind?

A. Yes, they are.

Q. Are the employees told about the VOA church when they are applying and taken through the orientation process?

A. Yes, they are.

Q. Do they review the VOA manual when they come on board?

A. Yes, they are required to do that.

Q. When employees are hired, I assume you are involved in the hiring process and the orientation process also?

A. For most of the staff, yes.

Q. When their individual jobs are described to them, do you go into the VOA religious mission and the spiritual aspect of the treatment with them?

A. I do. That's made very succinct with all of the staff.

Q. Are the employees expected to carry out the VOA religious mission in their jobs?

A. Yes and with that—and I also sit in on practically all of the job reviews. There is a segment in the job performance review that we relate specifically to that area.

Q. So they are evaluated on how well they carry out the VOA religious mission?
A. Yes.
Q. They are required by their job to carry out the religious mission?
A. They are.
Q. It's partly your job to make sure that this is carried out?
A. That is correct.
Q. These matters are discussed with them during their job evaluations?
A. Right.
Q. Are the employees employed by the VOA church?
A. Yes, they are.

(T.-60, 61, 62).

The record could not be more clear that all employees at the Ranch are hired, evaluated and retained on the basis of how well they carry out the mission of the VOA church. This is not a case where the church has defined for itself what constitutes a religious activity; rather, it is the religious belief of the VOA that a person's physical, emotional and spiritual needs must be dealt with as a whole to bring that person to the immediate and active service of God. The VOA does not provide the services at the Bar None Boys Ranch for a humanitarian, secular purpose only. These services are provided for the express purpose of bringing the children and adolescents at the Ranch to the immediate and active service of God.

In its Brief in Opposition, the Board mischaracterizes the record in two regards. First, childcare workers are not the only employees at the Ranch who are expected to carry out the religious mission of the church. Mr. Wenndt did testify concerning childcare workers and how they would carry out the religious mission of the church, but never suggested that they were the only employees who carried out the church's mission. (T.-54). Second, the Board suggests that childcare workers

carry out the VOA's religious mission only by providing a positive role model. This miscomprehends the nature of the work done by childcare workers. Mr. Wenndt testified that "[m]y belief and some of the staff's belief is that they [the children at the Ranch] can't come to believe in God because God is exemplified as God the Father and on a trust relationship level, some of these children don't have a very good trust relationship with their fathers. So before they can build a trust relationship with God as the Father, they must first identify with a staff so that relationship can begin to grow." (*Id.*). The positive role model presented by the childcare worker is important because "through their direct dealings with the children that they would, you know, come about to discuss spiritual aspects of life." (*Id.*). It is clear and uncontroverted that the services provided to the children and adolescents at the Ranch are designed to enable them to come to the immediate and active service of God. It is incomprehensible that such services could be characterized as secular.

The Board's reliance on *Tony & Susan Alamo Foundation v. Secretary of State,* No. 83-1935, 53 U.S.L.W. 4489 (April 23, 1985), is misplaced. In that case, this Court held that the requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA") applied to the commercial activities of a non-profit, religious foundation. The case is distinguishable from the instant action because the services involved in *Tony & Susan Alamo Foundation* were commercial activities that competed with private businesses and were conducted for the purpose of raising money for the foundation. 53 U.S.L.W. at 4490. In contrast, the services at issue in this action are the primary religious activities of the VOA. Second, the provisions of the FLSA are substantially different from the provisions of the NLRA. As this Court made clear in *Catholic Bishop,* there is a significant risk of government entanglement in religious affairs when the provisions of the NLRA are applied to a church operated facility. Conceivably, the risk is less significant with the application of the FLSA. Finally, the legislative history of the FLSA demonstrates a congressional intent to encompass the

commercial activities of a religious foundation. 53 U.S.L.W. at 4491. There is no such legislative history for the NLRA demonstrating that Congress intended to bring the primary religious activities of a bona fide church within the jurisdiction of the Board.

A decision that the Board's jurisdiction does not extend to the Bar None Boys Ranch would be a limited one. It would hold only that the Board's jurisdiction does not extend to the primary religious activities of a bona fide church. Unlike other churches where the provision of social services is secondary to the churches' primary activities, the services provided at the Bar None Boys Ranch are religious activities and conducted for the express purpose of bringing the children and adolescents at the Ranch to the immediate and active service of God. It is this fundamental distinction that renders the cases cited by the Board inapposite to the instant action. *See* Brief in Opposition at 10-11.

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

Dated this fourteenth day of June, 1985.

Respectfully submitted,
HOLLAND & HART

By _____
John M. Husband
Michael M. Shultz

ATTORNEYS FOR
PETITIONER
VOA-MINNESOTA-BAR
NONE BOYS RANCH

555 Seventeenth Street
Suite 2900
Post Office Box 8749
Denver, Colorado 80201
Telephone: (303) 295-8000